



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,807	12/18/2001	Todd Wostrel	TI-32597	6004

23494 7590 06/13/2005

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED

P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999

DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER

SANTIAGO, ENRIQUE L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2671

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/025,807

Applicant(s)

WOSTREL, TODD

Examiner

Enrique L. Santiago

Art Unit

2671

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett, US Patent Publication No. US 2002/0140734 A1 in view of Copel US patent no. 6,735,556 B2.

-Regarding claim 1, Bennett discloses a software program stored on a computer media (paragraph 107, lines 1-8) which provides a user interface for the computing device (see paragraph 236, lines 1-9) comprising a display grid having rows and columns of cells (see paragraph 188, lines 1-5) a number displayed in a plurality of the cells (see paragraph 248, line 12) on a plurality of adjacent rows and columns (see fig. 4, where 100.00 is displayed on 2 adjacent rows and fig. 1, where 1.00 is displayed on 2 adjacent columns) and where the numbers displayed in the cells are updated under software control and represent a common property which changes according to an algorithm set by a user (see paragraph 183, where "quantity" can be considered a "property" of an object, and fig. 3 which illustrates "fiscal data" represented in rows and columns that can be considered a "common property" of the various Amalgamated Fruit Inc. subdivisions). Bennett does not disclose a handheld computer device although it does disclose combining a calculator program with the functionality of a spreadsheet (paragraph 29). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace a handheld computer device for a calculator, because the terms are synonymous.

Art Unit: 2671

Bennett does not disclose changes in a real-time simulation display. However in similar art Copel teaches said limitation (see column 5, lines 40-62, column 8, lines 31-36).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bennett with the properties of Copel, because it would allow for better understanding of simulation results and would help to reduce the time required for product and process design (see column 1, lines 29-45).

-Regarding claim 2, Bennett discloses the software program further comprising a cursor operable by the user, which indicates at least one currently selected cell (see paragraph 191, lines 1-4).

-Regarding claim 3, Bennett does not directly disclose the cursor as a dashed cell outline. However it does disclose that a black box or "many other techniques" may be deployed to identify the cursor (see paragraph 191). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to represent the cursor with a dashed cell outline, because it would provide the user with a focus for the selected cell.

-Regarding claim 4, Bennett discloses allowing the user to set at least one cell to a fixed value (see paragraph 182, line 9).

-Regarding claim 5, Bennett discloses allowing the user to adjust the value of a cursor-selected cell up or down while the software is changing the numbers in the cells according to the algorithm (see paragraph 172 where Bennett provides for the modification of fields).

-Regarding claim 6, the remarks presented above with respect to claims 3 and 4 apply equally to this claim.

Art Unit: 2671

-Regarding claim 7, the remarks presented above with respect to claim 5 apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 8, Bennett does not specifically disclose where the software is programmed to provide a heat transfer lab simulation environment. However, since the heat transfer simulation is merely a mathematical calculation, it can be implemented under Bennett (see paragraph 183 which provides for mathematical calculations).

-Regarding claim 9, the remarks presented above with respect to claim 1 apply equally to this claim. In addition, Bennett discloses a display screen an input device and a processor (see fig. 43, paragraph 104).

-Regarding claim 10, the remarks presented above with respect to claim 2 apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 11, the remarks presented above with respect to claim 3 apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 12, the remarks presented above with respect to claim 4 apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 13, the remarks presented above with respect to claim 5 apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 14, the remarks presented above with respect to claim 6 apply equally to this claim.

-Regarding claim 15, the remarks presented above with respect to claim 5 apply equally to this claim.

Art Unit: 2671

-Regarding claim 16, the remarks presented above with respect to claim 9 apply equally to this claim.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US patent no. 6,803,912 B1: US patent no. 5,835,693

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2671

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Enrique L Santiago whose telephone number is (571) 272-7648.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:00 A.M. to 3:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Zimmerman whose telephone number is (571) 272-7653, can be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:00 A.M. to 3:30 P.M.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:


703 872-9306 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to [Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor] (Receptionist).

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Enrique L. Santiago

June 8, 2005



Kee M. Tung
Primary Examiner